# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:

    Sandeep Betarbet

Serial No.: 10/706,397

Filed: November 12, 2003

For: Terminating File Handling System

Confirmation No.: 6855

Group Art Unit: 2444

Examiner: Bengzon, Greg C.

Docket No. 030165; 190250-1460

## RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Mail Stop: RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

    In response to the final Office Action of January 14, 2010, please consider the enclosed remarks and amendments. In accordance with 37 U.S.C. §1.114, a Request for Continued Examination is filed concurrently with this Response.

### *AUTHORIZATION TO DEBIT ACCOUNT*

    It is believed that no extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those which may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit account no. 20-0778.

<center>**LISTING OF CLAIMS**</center>

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

1. (Currently Amended) A file handling system, comprising:

a terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer having a processor, the terminating file ~~server~~ computer operable to receive a file transfer message from an originating file transfer ~~server~~ computer along with at least one file, the file transfer message including details about the transfer of ~~said~~ the at least one file including a local user and at least one filename for ~~said~~ the at least one file, the terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent;

the agent operable to read the file transfer message received from the originating file transfer ~~server~~ computer, and direct the transfer of ~~said~~ the at least one filename and ~~said~~ the at least one file associated with ~~said~~ the at least one filename to a home directory of the terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer, the home directory associated with the local user in accordance with instructions from a configuration file residing in the home directory; and

the configuration file residing in the home directory, and operable to instruct the agent ~~to~~, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, to transfer ~~said~~ the at least one file from the home directory to a remote ~~host~~ computer specified in the configuration file, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote ~~host~~ computer thereby allowing transfer of ~~said~~ the at least one file to the remote ~~host~~ computer without necessitating the remote ~~host~~ computer being logged on the terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer.

2. (Canceled)

3. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, wherein the remote ~~host~~ computer is associated with the local user.

4. (Canceled)

5. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, wherein the agent is further operable to transmit ~~said~~ the at least one file to the remote ~~host~~ computer.

6. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 5, wherein the agent is further operable to delete ~~said~~ the at least one file from the home directory in accordance with the configuration file.

7. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, wherein the terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer ~~is~~ comprises a Connect:Direct server.

8. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, further comprising:
a port monitor at the remote ~~terminal~~ computer operable to monitor communications to the remote ~~host~~ computer on a port specified by the configuration file.

9. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 1, further comprising means for monitoring a port of the remote ~~host~~ computer for communications from the agent.

10. (Currently Amended) A method of handling files on a ~~Connect:Direct server~~ computer, comprising:

receiving a file transfer message from an originating file transfer ~~server~~ computer at a terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer;

in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent;

determining, by the agent, a home directory of the terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer from a local user associated with the file transfer message;

storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory;

retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote ~~host~~ computer, the configuration file instructing the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file; and

transmitting, via the agent, ~~said~~ the at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote ~~host~~ computer without necessitating the remote ~~host~~ computer being logged on the terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer.

11. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the method further comprises:

responsive to the configuration file, removing the message from the home directory.

12. (Canceled)

13. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 10, wherein the remote ~~host~~ computer is associated with the local user.

14. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 10, further comprising using an agent program to direct the transfer of ~~said~~ the at least one file to the home directory.

15. (Canceled)

16. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 10, using a Connect:Direct server to receive the file transfer message.

17. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 10, further comprising:
monitoring a port at ~~a~~ the remote ~~terminal~~ computer specified by the configuration file.

18. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 17, further comprising:
receiving ~~said~~ the at least one file at the port specified by the configuration file.

19. (Currently Amended) A Connect:Direct file handling system, comprising:
a terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer having a processor;
an agent; and
a configuration file;
the terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer launching the agent upon receipt of a file transfer message, the file transfer message comprising a local username and at least one filename, and the agent directing the transfer of and storage of at least one file associated with the filename to a home directory of the terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer associated with the username, the agent reading the configuration file, and transferring ~~said~~ the at least one file from the home directory to a remote ~~host~~ computer specified by the configuration file without necessitating the remote ~~host~~ computer being logged on the terminating file ~~server~~ computer, wherein the configuration file ~~is operable~~ instructs the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file and to store a host name and a port number associated with the remote ~~host~~ computer.

20. (Canceled)

21. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 19, wherein the agent is operable to remove ~~said~~ the at least one file from the home directory after transferring ~~said~~ the at least one file to the remote ~~host~~ computer.

22. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 19, further comprising:

a port monitor at a remote ~~host~~ computer, the port monitor being operable to monitor a port specified in the configuration file

23. (Currently Amended) The system of claim 22, further comprising:

a file processor located at the remote ~~terminal~~ computer, the file processor being operable to receive files via the port monitor, and assign ~~said~~ the at least one filename to ~~said~~ the at least one file received, respectively.

24. (Currently Amended) A computer diskette having a program for handling files on a ~~Connect:Direct server~~ computer, wherein the computer diskette is a physical structure executed by ~~a~~ the computer and the program is operable to perform:

receiving a file transfer message from an originating file transfer ~~server~~ computer at a terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer;

in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent;

determining, by the agent, a home directory of the terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer from a local user associated with the file transfer message;

storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory;

retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote ~~host~~ computer and instructions for the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file; and

transmitting, via the agent, ~~said~~ the at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote ~~host~~ computer without necessitating the remote ~~host~~ computer being logged on the terminating file transfer ~~server~~ computer.

25. (Previously Presented) The computer diskette of claim 24, the program further operable to perform:

responsive to the configuration file, removing the message from the home directory.

26. (Canceled)

27. (Currently Amended) The computer diskette of claim 24, wherein the remote ~~host~~ computer is associated with the local user.

28. (Canceled)

29. (Currently Amended) The computer diskette of claim 24, the program further operable to perform using an agent program to transmit ~~said~~ the at least one file responsive to the configuration file

30. (Previously Presented) The computer diskette of claim 29, the program further operable to perform using a Connect:Direct server to receive the file transfer message.

31. (Currently Amended) The computer diskette of claim 24, the program further operable to perform:

monitoring a port at a remote ~~host~~ computer specified by the configuration file.

32. (Currently Amended) The computer diskette of claim 31, the program further operable to perform:

receiving ~~said~~ the at least one file at the port specified by the configuration file.

## REMARKS

1.  Present Status of Patent Application

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action of January 14, 2010. Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21-24, 27, 29, and 31-32 have been amended. No new matter is introduced with these amendments. In the present response, claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13-14, 16-19, 21-25, 27, and 29-32 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

2.  Telephone Interview

The Examiner is encouraged to contact Assignee's attorney, after reviewing the present response, to resolve or discuss any questions or outstanding issues in an effort to expedite examination of the present application.

3.  Response to Objection to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification as allegedly failing to provide antecedent basis for "a file transfer server having a processor," as recited in claims 1 and 19. To address the Examiner's concerns, the claims have been amended to recite a file transfer computer as opposed to a file transfer server. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

4.  Response to Rejections of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13-14, 16-19, 21-22, 24-25, 27, and 29-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Persels* (U.S. Patent No. 7,065,547) in view of *Hashem* (U.S. Patent No. 7,155,578). Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Persels* in view of *Hashem* in further view of *Campbell* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0086298)

a. Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites:

A file handling system, comprising:

a terminating file transfer computer having a processor, the terminating file computer operable to receive a file transfer message from an originating file transfer computer along with at least one file, the file transfer message including details about the transfer of the at least one file including a local user and at least one filename for the at least one file, the terminating file transfer computer in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent;

the agent operable to read the file transfer message received from the originating file transfer computer, and direct the transfer of the at least one filename and the at least one file associated with the at least one filename to a home directory of the terminating file transfer computer, the home directory associated with the local user in accordance with instructions from a configuration file residing in the home directory; and

*the configuration file residing in the home directory, and operable to instruct the agent, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, to transfer the at least one file from the home directory to a remote computer specified in the configuration file, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote computer thereby allowing transfer of the at least one file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer*.

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Persels* in view of *Hashem* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "the configuration file residing in the home directory, and operable to instruct the agent, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, to transfer the at least one file from the home directory to a remote computer specified in the configuration file, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote computer thereby allowing transfer of the at least one file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer," as emphasized above.

The Office Action contends that *Persels* discloses "a configuration file residing in the home directory of the terminating file transfer server, (Persels-Column 7 Lines 10-20, 'administrative [data] pertaining to iBox') and operable to instruct an agent to, after

saving the at least one file to the home directory, (Persels-Column 6 Lines 15-20, 'the message is retained in the eFORWARD server database') transfer said at least one file to a remote host." Page 10 (Emphasis removed).

In response, Assignee notes that "[p]referably, the administrative data includes: subscriber ID's, iBox<sup>SM</sup> ID's, passwords, and trading relationships, all of which are used to validate sending and receiving requests." Col. 7, lines 35-38. Therefore, the administrative data is not disclosed to contain instructions to transfer a file to a remote host or computer. Rather, the administrative data includes information needed to validate a request to transfer or receive a file and does not indicate a host name or port name of a remote computer where a saved file in a home directory is to be transferred.

Also, in *Persels*, where the reference describes that "the message is retained in the eFORWARD database 24 until the partner iBox<sup>SM</sup> eDIRECT client contacts the eFORWARD Server 12 and requests delivery," the reference is describing retaining the message while the receiving iBox is not available. *See* col. 6, lines 15-20. As such, since the Office Action construes the iBox as a home directory, the *Persels* reference fails to disclose "to instruct an agent to, <u>after saving the at least one file to the home directory</u>, transfer the at least one file to a remote host," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action does not suggest that *Hashem* remedies the foregoing deficiencies. Rather, the Office Action contends that *Hashem* discloses "allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server." *See* page 12. Therefore, the proposed combination of *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "the configuration file residing in the home directory, and operable to instruct the agent, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, to transfer the at least one file from the home directory to a remote computer specified in the configuration file, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote computer thereby allowing transfer of the at least one file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer," as recited in claim 1.

Further, regarding *Hashem* and its alleged disclosure of "allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged

on the terminating file transfer server," the Office Action states that *Hashem* automatically downloads files to a destination user without requiring the destination user to login to the terminal file server. *See* page 12 of Office Action and col. 5, lines 25-55 of *Hashem*. In response, Assignee respectfully submits that *Hashem* is describing the transfer of a file to a terminating file transfer server and not a remote host or computer. The file being transferred is sent from an originating site or computer to a terminating site or computer, where the claim is reciting transfer of a file from a home directory of a terminating file transfer computer (which received the file from an originating file transfer computer) to a remote computer. Thus, this passage of *Hashem* fails to disclose or describe that a file is downloaded to a destination user, as suggested in the Office Action. For example, *Hashem* does not disclose the further act of transferring the file from either an internal inbasket 52 or external inbasket 87 to a destination user.

For at least this additional reason, the proposed combination of *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "the configuration file residing in the home directory, and operable to instruct the agent, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, to transfer the at least one file from the home directory to a remote computer specified in the configuration file, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of the remote computer thereby allowing transfer of the at least one file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over *Persels* in view of *Hashem*, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 3 and 5-9

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 3 and 5-9 depend from and include the features of claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 3 and 5-9 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Claim 10

Independent claim 10 recites:

> A method of handling files on a computer, comprising:
> receiving a file transfer message from an originating file transfer computer at a terminating file transfer computer;
> in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent;
> determining, by the agent, a home directory of the terminating file transfer computer from a local user associated with the file transfer message;
> storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory;
> ***retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote computer, the configuration file instructing the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file; and***
> ***transmitting, via the agent, the at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer.***

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 10 is allowable for at least the reason that *Persels* in view of *Hashem* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote computer, the configuration file instructing the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file; and transmitting, via the agent, the at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer," as emphasized above.

The Office Action contends that *Persels* discloses "a configuration file residing in the home directory of the terminating file transfer server, (Persels-Column 7 Lines 10-20, 'administrative [data] pertaining to iBox') and operable to instruct an agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, (Persels-Column 6 Lines 15-20, 'the

message is retained in the eFORWARD server database') transfer said at least one file to a remote host." Page 10 (Emphasis removed).

In response, Assignee notes that "[p]referably, the administrative data includes: subscriber ID's, iBox<sup>SM</sup> ID's, passwords, and trading relationships, all of which are used to validate sending and receiving requests." Col. 7, lines 35-38. Therefore, the administrative data is not disclosed to contain instructions to transfer a file to a remote host or computer. Rather, the administrative data includes information needed to validate a request to transfer or receive a file and does not indicate a host name or port name of a remote computer where a saved file in a home directory is to be transferred.

Also, in *Persels*, where the reference describes that "the message is retained in the eFORWARD database 24 until the partner iBox<sup>SM</sup> eDIRECT client contacts the eFORWARD Server 12 and requests delivery," the reference is describing retaining the message while the receiving iBox is not available. *See* col. 6, lines 15-20. As such, since the Office Action construes the iBox as a home directory, the *Persels* reference fails to disclose "the configuration file instructing the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file," as recited in claim 10.

The Office Action does not suggest that *Hashem* remedies the foregoing deficiencies. Rather, the Office Action contends that *Hashem* discloses "allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server." *See* page 12. Therefore, the proposed combination of *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote computer, the configuration file instructing the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file; and transmitting, via the agent, the at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer," as recited in claim 10.

Further, regarding *Hashem* and its alleged disclosure of "allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," the Office Action states that *Hashem* automatically downloads files to a destination user without requiring the destination user to login to the terminal file server. *See* page 12 of Office Action and col. 5, lines 25-55 of *Hashem*. In response, Assignee respectfully submits that *Hashem* is describing the transfer of a file to a terminating file transfer server and not a remote host or computer. The file being transferred is sent from an originating site or computer to a terminating site or computer, where the claim is reciting transfer of a file from a home directory of a terminating file transfer computer (which received the file from an originating file transfer computer) to a remote computer. Thus, this passage of *Hashem* fails to disclose or describe that a file is downloaded to a destination user, as suggested in the Office Action. For example, *Hashem* does not disclose the further act of transferring the file from either an internal inbasket 52 or external inbasket 87 to a destination user.

For at least this additional reason, the proposed combination of *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote computer, the configuration file instructing the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file; and transmitting, via the agent, the at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer," as recited in claim 10.

Accordingly, claim 10 is patentable over *Persels* in view of *Hashem*, and the rejection of claim 10 should be withdrawn.


d. Claims 11, 13-14, and 16-18

For at least the reasons given above, claim 10 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 11, 13-14, and 16-18 depend from and include the features of claim 10 and recite additional features, claims 11, 13-14, and 16-18 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

e. Claim 19

Independent claim 19 recites:

> A Connect:Direct file handling system, comprising:
> a terminating file transfer computer having a processor;
> an agent; and
> a configuration file;
> the terminating file transfer computer launching the agent upon receipt of a file transfer message, the file transfer message comprising a local username and at least one filename, and the agent directing the transfer of and storage of at least one file associated with the filename to a home directory of the terminating file transfer computer associated with the username, the agent reading the configuration file, and transferring the at least one file from the home directory to a remote computer specified by the configuration file without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file computer, **wherein the configuration file instructs the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file and to store a host name and a port number associated with the remote computer**.

(Emphasis added).

Claim 19 is allowable for at least the reason that *Persels* in view of *Hashem* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "wherein the configuration file instructs the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file and to store a host name and a port number associated with the remote computer," as emphasized above.

The Office Action contends that *Persels* discloses "a configuration file residing in the home directory of the terminating file transfer server, (Persels-Column 7 Lines 10-20, 'administrative [data] pertaining to iBox') and operable to instruct an agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, (Persels-Column 6 Lines 15-20, 'the message is retained in the eFORWARD server database') transfer said at least one file to a remote host." Page 10 (Emphasis removed).

In response, Assignee notes that "[p]referably, the administrative data includes: subscriber ID's, iBox$^{SM}$ ID's, passwords, and trading relationships, all of which are used to validate sending and receiving requests." Col. 7, lines 35-38. Therefore, the administrative data is not disclosed to contain instructions to transfer a file to a remote

host or computer. Rather, the administrative data includes information needed to validate a request to transfer or receive a file and does not indicate a host name or port name of a remote computer where a saved file in a home directory is to be transferred.

Also, in *Persels*, where the reference describes that "the message is retained in the eFORWARD database 24 until the partner iBox[SM] eDIRECT client contacts the eFORWARD Server 12 and requests delivery," the reference is describing retaining the message while the receiving iBox is not available. *See* col. 6, lines 15-20. As such, since the Office Action construes the iBox as a home directory, the *Persels* reference fails to disclose "wherein the configuration file instructs the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file," as recited in claim 19.

The Office Action does not suggest that *Hashem* remedies the foregoing deficiencies. Rather, the Office Action contends that *Hashem* discloses "allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server." *See* page 12. Therefore, the proposed combination of *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "wherein the configuration file instructs the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file and to store a host name and a port number associated with the remote computer," as recited in claim 19.

Further, regarding *Hashem* and its alleged disclosure of "allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," the Office Action states that *Hashem* automatically downloads files to a destination user without requiring the destination user to login to the terminal file server. *See* page 12 of Office Action and col. 5, lines 25-55 of *Hashem*. In response, Assignee respectfully submits that *Hashem* is describing the transfer of a file to a terminating file transfer server and not a remote host or computer. The file being transferred is sent from an originating site or computer to a terminating site or computer, where the claim is reciting transfer of a file from a home directory of a terminating file transfer computer (which received the file from an originating file transfer computer) to a remote computer. Thus, this passage of *Hashem* fails to disclose or

describe that a file is downloaded to a destination user, as suggested in the Office Action. For example, *Hashem* does not disclose the further act of transferring the file from either an internal inbasket 52 or external inbasket 87 to a destination user.

For at least this additional reason, the proposed combination of *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "wherein the configuration file instructs the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file and to store a host name and a port number associated with the remote computer," as recited in claim 19.

Accordingly, claim 19 is patentable over *Persels* in view of *Hashem*, and the rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn.

f. Claims 21-23

For at least the reasons given above, claim 19 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 21-23 depend from and include the features of claim 19 and recite additional features, claims 21-23 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record. Additionally, *Campbell* does not remedy the deficiencies of *Persels* in view of *Hashem* with respect to independent claim 19.

g. Claim 24

Independent claim 24 recites:

> A computer diskette having a program for handling files on a computer, wherein the computer diskette is a physical structure executed by the computer and the program is operable to perform:
>
> receiving a file transfer message from an originating file transfer computer at a terminating file transfer computer;
>
> in response to receiving the file transfer message, executing an agent;
>
> determining, by the agent, a home directory of the terminating file transfer computer from a local user associated with the file transfer message;
>
> storing at least one file associated with the file transfer message in the home directory;
>
> **retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote computer and instructions for the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file; and**
>
> **transmitting, via the agent, the at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer.**

(Emphasis added).

Independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Persels* in view of *Hashem* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote computer and instructions for the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file; and transmitting, via the agent, the at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer," as emphasized above.

The Office Action contends that *Persels* discloses "a configuration file residing in the home directory of the terminating file transfer server, (Persels-Column 7 Lines 10-20, 'administrative [data] pertaining to iBox') and operable to instruct an agent to, after

saving the at least one file to the home directory, (Persels-Column 6 Lines 15-20, 'the message is retained in the eFORWARD server database') transfer said at least one file to a remote host." Page 10 (Emphasis removed).

In response, Assignee notes that "[p]referably, the administrative data includes: subscriber ID's, iBox<sup>SM</sup> ID's, passwords, and trading relationships, all of which are used to validate sending and receiving requests." Col. 7, lines 35-38. Therefore, the administrative data is not disclosed to contain instructions to transfer a file to a remote host or computer. Rather, the administrative data includes information needed to validate a request to transfer or receive a file and does not indicate a host name or port name of a remote computer where a saved file in a home directory is to be transferred.

Also, in *Persels*, where the reference describes that "the message is retained in the eFORWARD database 24 until the partner iBox<sup>SM</sup> eDIRECT client contacts the eFORWARD Server 12 and requests delivery," the reference is describing retaining the message while the receiving iBox is not available. *See* col. 6, lines 15-20. As such, since the Office Action construes the iBox as a home directory, the *Persels* reference fails to disclose "wherein the configuration file comprises . . . instructions for the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file," as recited in claim 24.

The Office Action does not suggest that *Hashem* remedies the foregoing deficiencies. Rather, the Office Action contends that *Hashem* discloses "allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server." *See* page 12. Therefore, the proposed combination of *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote computer and instructions for the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file; and transmitting, via the agent, the at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer," as recited in claim 24.

Further, regarding *Hashem* and its alleged disclosure of "allowing transfer of said at least one file to the remote host without necessitating the remote host being logged on the terminating file transfer server," the Office Action states that *Hashem* automatically downloads files to a destination user without requiring the destination user to login to the terminal file server. *See* page 12 of Office Action and col. 5, lines 25-55 of *Hashem*. In response, Assignee respectfully submits that *Hashem* is describing the transfer of a file to a terminating file transfer server and not a remote host or computer. The file being transferred is sent from an originating site or computer to a terminating site or computer, where the claim is reciting transfer of a file from a home directory of a terminating file transfer computer (which received the file from an originating file transfer computer) to a remote computer. Thus, this passage of *Hashem* fails to disclose or describe that a file is downloaded to a destination user, as suggested in the Office Action. For example, *Hashem* does not disclose the further act of transferring the file from either an internal inbasket 52 or external inbasket 87 to a destination user.

For at least this additional reason, the proposed combination of *Persels* in view of *Hashem* fails to teach or suggest at least "retrieving, by the agent, a configuration file from the home directory, wherein the configuration file comprises a host name and a port name of a remote computer and instructions for the agent to, after saving the at least one file to the home directory, transfer the at least one file from the home directory to the remote computer specified in the configuration file; and transmitting, via the agent, the at least one file responsive to the configuration file to the remote computer without necessitating the remote computer being logged on the terminating file transfer computer," as recited in claim 24.

Accordingly, claim 24 is patentable over *Persels* in view of *Hashem*, and the rejection of claim 24 should be withdrawn.

h. Claims 25, 27, and 29-32

For at least the reasons given above, claim 24 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 25, 27, and 29-32 depend from and include the features of claim 24 and recite additional features, claims 25, 27, and 29-32 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

## CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. In addition, Assignee reserves the right to address any comments made in the Office Action that were not specifically addressed herein. Thus, such comments should not be deemed admitted by the Assignee. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles W. Griggers/
**Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283**

**AT&T Legal Department – TKHR**
Attn: Patent Docketing
One AT&T Way
Room 2A-207
Bedminster, NJ 07921
Customer No.: **38823**